

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/669,893	SCHWARZE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nicholas D. Rosen	3625	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Nicholas D. Rosen. (3)_____

(2) J. Richard Soderberg. (4)_____

Date of Interview: 17 December 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1-35.

Identification of prior art discussed: Article, "HP Products Now Available at U.S. Navy's ITEC Mall".

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner Rosen and Mr. Soderberg spoke on December 13. Examiner Rosen said that the proposed amendments overcame the prior art previously applied, but he had found another article that rendered the amended claim 1 obvious. However, if claims 11 and 12 were incorporated into claim 1, it could be allowed. Examiner Rosen faxed Mr. Soderberg a proposed Examiner's Amendment, and the article ("HP Products Now Available"). On December 17, Mr. Soderberg called to say that his client had agreed to the proposed Examiner's Amendment.